

## **REMARKS**

### **I. Response to Interview Summary**

Applicant conducted an Examiner Interview on October 27, 2006. During that interview, claim 1 was discussed in light of the prior art references of record. Particularly, the Examiner expressed some uncertainty with regard to which of the claimed preferences were being aggregated. Applicant explained that, according to claim 1, information preferences received from the plurality of subscribers were aggregated. In response, the Examiner suggested that the claim be amended to more clearly point out this feature. Accordingly, Applicant has filed a Request for Continued Examination accompanied by the present amendment.

### **II. General**

Claims 1-24 are pending in the present application. Claims 1-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0107830 to Nanja (hereinafter *Nanja*) in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0176085 to Phillips et al. (hereinafter *Phillips*) and/or U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0199635 to Ta et al. (hereinafter *Ta*). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections of record.

Applicant has presented arguments and evidence which shows that the claims, as originally written, were patentable over the prior art of record. *See* Response to Non-Final Office Action of August 22, 2006. The Examiner has rejected those arguments and continues to uphold these rejections as set forth in the Final Office Action mailed October 2, 2006. Without conceding the propriety of these rejections, Applicant has amended claims 1, 3, 9, 11, 17, and 19 in an effort to expedite issuance of the present application. The amended claims do not present new subject matter as the claim limitations recited therein are fully supported by the specification as filed. *See e.g.*, paragraphs [0031]-[0040]; Figures 5 and 6.

Applicant asserts that claims 1, 9, and 17, as amended, recite limitations not taught or suggested by any combination of the prior art references of record. For example, claim 1, as amended, recites “aggregating . . . information preferences received from [a] plurality of

subscribers that correspond to a same data source provider into aggregated information preferences . . . .” Applicant points out that *Nanja* does not teach or suggest this limitation. Instead, *Nanja* merely discloses aggregating different requests received from the same, single user. See *Nanja*, paragraphs [0027]-[0034]. Neither *Phillips* nor *Ta* meet this limitation. Thus, a combination of *Nanja* with *Phillips* and/or *Ta*, even if proper, would also fail to teach or suggest such limitation. Claims 9 and 17 are patentable for similar reasons as claim 1, and claims 2-8, 10-16, and 18-24 are patentable at least due to their dependencies from claims 1, 9, and/or 17.


### III. Conclusion

In view of the above, Applicant believes the pending application is in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the pending claims be passed to issue.

Applicant believes no fee is due with this Response beyond the RCE fee addressed in the accompanying RCE and/or Transmittal(s). However, if any additional fee is due, please charge Deposit Account No. 06-2380, under Order No. 47583/P046US/10316464, from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Dated: December 1, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By   
Thomas J. Meaney  
Registration No.: 41,990  
FULBRIGHT & JAWORSKI L.L.P.  
2200 Ross Avenue, Suite 2800  
Dallas, Texas 75201-2784  
(214) 855-8230  
(214) 855-8200 (Fax)  
Attorney for Applicant